

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 13, 16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,317,729 to Mukherjee *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,071,909 to Geller.

In section 3, the Examiner submits that:

*“With regard to Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 Mukherjee discloses a method for producing a multi-layer text (which reads on establishing versions of data) (col. 1, lines 7-11), comprising (a) providing a text (master item file 14, col. 4, lines 20-23); (b) selecting a text segment (which reads on engineering change affected item file 16) (col. 4, lines 20-23); (c) assigning value of a text dimension to said text segment, (which reads on item related data) (col. 5, lines 7-41); repeating steps (b) and (c) as many times as desired (which reads on creating engineering change notices) (col. 4, lines 24-47).”*

Applicants note that the same rejection *verbatim* was raised in the previous Official Action dated August 4, 2003, however in the latter, the rejection was under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants further note that in Section 5 of the Official Action, the Examiner indicated that “*Applicant’s arguments...have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s)*”.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s stance as to the relevance of the ‘729 patent and draw the Examiner’s attention to the detailed arguments set forth in the reply to the previous Official Action filed on August 8, 2003.

In particular, Applicants draw the Examiner’s attention to the general comments explaining the distinguishing features of the claimed invention over the cited ‘729 patent (page 3, last paragraph to page 7, line 3) and to the specific counter arguments which address the Examiner’s arguments (page 7, line 6 to paragraph 8, second paragraph).

In light of this discussion, Applicants believe that the ‘729 patent does not teach on the following limitations (marked in underline):

- “1. A method for producing a multi-layer text, comprising  
(a) providing a text;



- (b) selecting a text segment;
- (c) assigning a value of a text dimension to said text segment, wherein a text dimension refers to any desired domain and includes information on one related text layer;
- (d) repeating steps (b) and (c) as many times as desired."

Applicants fully concur with the Examiner's observation that the '729 patent does not teach: "wherein a text dimension refers to any desired domain and includes information on one related text layer".

In page 3 the Examiner contends that Geller discloses a printer that includes the latter limitation and refers to col. 5 lines 10-32 of the Geller patent. In this regard, we note that Geller discloses a technique that refers to physical dimensions that relate to printing characters within spatial areas (see, for instance, col. 5 line 10 to wit: "*In imprinting characters within spatial areas 53...*" and lines 14 to 16, to wit: "*Each of the margins in the spatial areas 53 and 54 is measured by the appropriate dimension of two adjacent area locations 32...*"). If at all, the physical dimension of Geller refers to the one and only possible domain, i.e. size of two adjacent area locations.

The dimension and domain of Geller have nothing to do with the dimensions and domain of the presently claimed invention. By way of non limiting example, the dimension in accordance with the presently claimed invention does not relate to some kind of physical characteristics of the printed text and obviously is not bound to a single domain (size) as is in the Geller patent. In this regard, other exemplary dimensions of the presently claimed invention are time dimension, Dimension of Place, Spokesman dimension and reference dimension (see page 2, line 23 to page 3, line 9 of the instant specification). The present claim element recites *text dimension refers to any desired domain* (and the latter example illustrated 4 non limiting examples) in contrast to Geller where only one domain (size) is applicable. The instant specification also discloses that "*the dimension and value thereof do not necessarily form an integral part of the text*" (page 3, lines 18-19). This is in clear contrast to the physical dimension of Geller which inherently refers to the text and therefore constitutes an integral part thereof. In other words a printed text must also have size.

It is accordingly submitted that the '729 patent does not teach the claim elements (marked in underline above) required by presently pending claim 1. It is also submitted that Geller does not



teach on the element *wherein a text dimension refers to any desired domain and includes information on one related text layer*. Accordingly, combining the teachings of the '729 patent and the Geller patent would not lead to the presently claimed invention, and consequently the Examiner did not meet the burden of showing *prima facie* obviousness, contrary to the stipulations of MPEP § 2142.

Even if, for the sake of discussion, the specified elements are anticipated by the '729 patent as the Examiner contents in the last paragraph of page 3 of the Official Action, the Examiner did not show a motivation to combine the teachings of the '729 patent with the (physical) text dimensions in the (size) domain of Geller to arrive at the presently claimed invention allowing *text dimensions that refer to any desired domain* (such as time, place, spokesman etc.), contrary to the stipulations of MPEP § 2143.01.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

It is also submitted that the rejection of claims 6, 11 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn, for similar reasons discussed in detail above with reference to claim 1.

It is further submitted that the rejection of dependent Claims 3, 8-10 and 13, and 18-20 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn, *inter alia*, as they are dependent on the respective independent claims, which Applicants believes are novel and non-obvious over the cited prior art as noted above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently claimed invention is unobvious over Mukherjee et al. in view of Geller and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of presently pending claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 13, 16, and 18-20.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of pending claims presently pending claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 13, 16, and 18-20 and allow



all pending claims 1-21. Favorable action with an early allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC**

*June 22, 2004*  
NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC  
1030 15<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 775-8383  
Fax: (202) 775-8396  
GMN:MCB:JBG:ROA.doc

*Gary M. Nath*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary M. Nath  
Reg. No. 26,965  
Joshua B. Goldberg  
Reg. No. 44,126  
Customer No. 20529